

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/669,649

Attorney Docket No.: Q77615

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please remove Figs. 2, 4, 5 and 6 and replace with Replacement Figs. 2, 4, 5 and 6.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 12-17 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-11 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 12-14 are amended. No new matter is presented.

The outstanding objections and rejections are traversed, as set forth in detail below.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings because element 24 of Figures 2, 4, 5, and 6 should be changed to “VOICE SIGNAL OUTPUT PART.” Applicant submits herewith Replacement Figures 2, 4, 5, and 6, in which element 24 of these Figures is amended as suggested. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the title as being non-descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to recite: “LAN COMMUNICATION METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR TRANSMITTING AND RECEIVING PACKETS WITH CORRECTION CODE DATA”. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is therefore requested.

The specification is further objected to because the reference to “literature 1” on page 1, line 18, is not defined. Applicant notes that the specification is amended to delete the reference to “literature 1”, and withdrawal of this objection is requested.

With respect to the informalities noted by the Examiner at pages 22, 23, 24, and 26, Applicant has amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of objections is therefore requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 12 and 14 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claims 12 and 14 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. With respect to claims 1, 3, 4, and 10, the objections are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims is therefore requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses.

In regards to claims 1-6, Applicant submits that this ground of rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-6 without prejudice or disclaimer.

With respect to claim 13, the Examiner contends that "it is unclear what how [sic] the degree of failure meeting the transmitted CODEC data packets affects/triggers the issuing of a command for reducing the number of CODEC data packets to be multiplexed." (Office Action at 4-5.)

Applicant notes that claim 13 presently recites, *inter alia*, “when the degree of failure of meeting of the transmitted CODEC data packet number by the actually received CODED data packets exceeds a predetermined threshold value, issuing a command for reducing the number of CODED data packets to be multiplexed as a request command to be issued to the simultaneous transmission packet setting part on the transmitting side.” Further, Applicant notes that this feature is discussed, for example, at pages 23-24 of the specification. Applicant therefore submits that claim 13 is sufficiently clear and definite, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Borella (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,606 B1), and claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Borella (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,606 B1) in view of an art of record, “Overview of Voice over IP” by Udani et al. (hereinafter “AOR”).

Applicant submits that these rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-11 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims. Applicant notes that claim 12 is amended to incorporate the features of base claim 7 and intervening claim 10, and submits that claim 12 is allowable at least by virtue of reciting the features of former dependent claim 12. Allowance of claim 12 is therefore requested.

With respect to claim 13, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection is believed to be overcome, as noted above. Allowance of claim 13 is therefore requested.

Claims 14-17 have been indicated by the Examiner as being allowed. Applicant notes that claims 13 and 14 are amended to address informalities, but are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons previously indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/669,649

Attorney Docket No.: Q77615

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian K. Shelton
Registration No. 50,245

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: **October 16, 2007**